C. L. Cofey

NOVEMBER 1961

FIFTY CENTS

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 13

7

THE FRANKENSTEIN MONSTER

THE EDITORS

MAN-MADE DISEASES

A RESEARCH PHYSICIAN

ECONOMIC PLANNING IN BLACK AFRICA

CHARLES BETTELHEIM

A Modest Proposal—Let Our Children Go

JAMES R. NEWMAN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS

VOLUME THIRTEEN NUMBER SEVEN NOVEMBER 1961

RIEVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Frankenstein Monster 289
A MODEST PROPOSAL—LET OUR CHILDREN GO by James R. Newman.... 299
MAN-MADE DISEASES by A Research Physician 303
ECONOMIC PLANNING IN BLACK AFRICA by Charles Bettelheim 310
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 326

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copywright, ©1961, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, New York. Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 102 Beverly Road, Bloomfield, N. J.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One Year—$5; two years—$9.
By 1st class mail—United States $7; everywhere else $8.
By air mail—No. America $9; So. America $14; Europe $18; Asia and Africa $24.
EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

Every autumn periodicals enjoying second class mailing privileges have to make a sworn declaration containing, among other information, figures on paid circulation. Ours is printed on p. 335, and we commend it to your attention. Our circulation figure is now 7,641, which represents an increase over last year's figure of slightly more than 20 percent. That this is a very gratifying result needs no emphasis. And yet in a way it is a cause of frustration, too. We know from our mail and from direct inquiries that a large proportion of the new subscribers of the last year would have been MR readers a long time ago if they had only known there was such a magazine. We also know that if it had not been for our *Cuba* book, they would still be ignorant of MR's existence. We are not saying that the *Cuba* book reached a really broad reading public: it was reviewed in only a few places, and by commercial publishers' standards the sale has been modest enough. Even so, it enabled us to reach many people who never heard of us before, and once they heard of us they became subscribers. Doesn't this suggest that the potential audience for MR is vastly greater than anything we have been able to tap so far? We think so. We think that the basic, indeed almost the only, obstacle to further expansion of circulation is ignorance of our existence.

How to overcome this obstacle? Some magazines can afford to spend $10 to get a $5 subscription: they get well known. We don't have that kind of money. We do what we can in the way of advertising and promotion, but it's not enough to make much difference. The only other way

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FRANKENSTEIN MONSTER

Considerable evidence has accumulated in the last few weeks that the Kennedy administration has at last begun to understand that the stakes in the German game are enormously high—and that the United States holds a losing hand. Hence repeated hints of negotiations, possible settlements, etc. Manifestly, a desire exists in high quarters, if not to withdraw from the game at least to reduce the stakes and to hope for a better hand on the next deal.

To appreciate why this should be so, it is necessary to understand just how hopeless the Western position now is. Ostensibly, Western policy is to maintain the status quo with respect to both Berlin and East Germany. Short-run success for this policy would simply mean that Berlin would remain an armed outpost of the Western alliance from which every form of hostile activity against the socialist bloc could be carried out; and East Germany would continue to be without international recognition or defined borders, potentially fair game for the West German revenge-seekers and expansionists. The sealing of the boundary between East and West Berlin has already dealt this policy a serious blow.* The Soviet Union and East Germany have demonstrated that they have the power to change the status quo unilaterally, not in some minor detail but in one of its most important aspects, the existence of the free escape route for refugees. And the Western allies have demonstrated for their part that they are by no means as ready to risk a world war to maintain the status quo in Germany as they have so loudly claimed in recent months. While most of the United States press treated the border closing as an occasion for grotesquely sentimentalized "human interest" stories, the *Wall Street Journal,* in an August 25th dispatch from Paris, correctly assessed the event in the following somber terms:

A gloomy conviction the West has been seriously outmaneu-

* Our editorial entitled "The Continuing Crisis" in the September issue went to the printer on August 12th, one day before the closing of the border, which accounts for its failure to take note of this extremely important development.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vered in the first skirmish of the Berlin crisis is settling over many Allied diplomats in Paris, in London, in Bonn, and in West Berlin. . . . The belief is that, in spite of all the talk of Allied unity, firmness, preparation, and willingness to risk action to keep West Berlin's 2.2 million citizens free and prosperous, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev in the past two weeks has not only gained much of what he wants but has been given good reason to believe he will get the rest.

In the eyes of those who view the Berlin developments thus far with gloom, perhaps the most serious effect has been the exposure of what appears to be continued disunity and indecision among the Allies at a time when the very crisis they have been anticipating is upon them. This was responsible, they say, for the nearly disastrous fall in morale of the West Berliners, a fall only partially and temporarily remedied by the visit of Vice President Johnson and reinforcement of the American troop garrison in West Berlin.

What happened once can obviously happen again. So long as there is no generally accepted statute defining the status and rights of West Berlin, that city is unavoidably at the mercy of unilateral action on the part of the Soviet Union and East Germany. All access routes run through East German territory, and already more than 90 percent of traffic from the West to Berlin is controlled by East German authorities. Without doing anything as drastic as imposing a blockade, they can keep the city in a continuous state of economic uncertainty and psychological crisis. Already, there have been reliable reports of reluctance on the part of West German businessmen to continue investing in Berlin, and of eagerness on the part of young people to seek their fortunes in West Germany. Imagine what it would be like after five or ten more years of pressure and crisis! West Berlin, from being a shiny showpiece of capitalism and the potential capital of a reunited Reich, would turn into a ghost town of old people and shattered illusions.

This is the prospect if there is no settlement, and it is necessary to understand that the West could prevent its realization in one way and one way only, through initiating a nuclear war. Any resort to conventional weapons would of course be easily repulsed by the Russians: militarily speaking Berlin is a defenseless enclave far behind their front lines. And a nuclear

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war, as everybody knows, would "solve" the Berlin crisis only by wiping out the city, perhaps along with the rest of human civilization.

Ah, yes, the nuclear strategists will say, but you forget about the deterrent power of the *threat* of nuclear war. All we have to do is make clear that under given circumstances we *will* wage nuclear war; in that case the Russians, who certainly don't want to commit suicide over Berlin, will see to it that the given circumstances do not arise. Here is the formula which will enable us to maintain and protect the status quo in Berlin. Unfortunately for those who champion this view, the sealing of the Berlin border exposed its weakness for all to see. A drastic change in the status quo was met by the West with nothing more serious than a diplomatic protest. And with very good reason: any show of force would have called forth superior force and would very soon have confronted the Western policy-makers with the grim choice of accepting a humiliating defeat or launching a nuclear war. Very wisely, they declined to take the fatal first step along this slippery path. Does anyone imagine that the response to the next unilateral move from the East will be essentially different, that some relatively minor harassment of West Berlin's communications, for example, will induce the NATO powers to accept the choice of defeat or nuclear war? And if not the next move, what about the next, and the next, and so on indefinitely?

It will no doubt be said that the cumulative effect of all the moves, leading as they eventually must to the ruin of West Berlin, amounts precisely to a humiliating defeat for the West; that the choice of defeat or nuclear war therefore cannot be avoided; that the West must accept it *now* and make *absolutely* clear that the response to the next move *will* be nuclear war. Then, so the argument runs, the Russians will hold their hand and all will be saved.

The trouble with this argument is simple: the Russians do not believe that the West will blow up the world if, for example, the East Germans should decide that transport by car and truck to Berlin from West Germany would have to be interrupted for a few weeks to permit repair of the *Autobahn*. Nor for that matter does anyone else in Europe who really counts believe it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The West German news weekly *Der Spiegel* (roughly equivalent to *Time* in this country) expressed the all-but unanimous view of responsible Europeans when it said in an editorial (July 12): "War over Berlin, war without a provoking Soviet surprise attack, is impossible. . . . Only if we keep it clearly in mind that the West cannot start a war because of Berlin is a political plan still possible." It is quite true that they may be wrong: we Americans know better than they do what our government is capable of. But that doesn't change the fact that the Russians' non-belief in the West's willingness to start a nuclear war over Berlin completely destroys the deterrent theory. They closed the Berlin border, and they will take whatever further measures they consider relevant and effective. If the United States (almost certainly without the consent or participation of the other NATO powers) should start a nuclear war somewhere along the line, well, that would be that. The Russians, in other words, may be wrong, but they won't be deterred. There is a big difference.

All of this apparently began to dawn on official Washington on or soon after August 13th. At first, one supposes, the reaction must have been one of despair. The United States has invested a tremendous amount of prestige in Berlin; defeat there would certainly be a staggering blow to the country's international credibility and standing; Mao Tse-tung's famous "paper tiger" theory would be spectacularly confirmed. And yet the alternative must have seemed to be not victory, not maintenance of the status quo, but nuclear annihilation of all concerned. A more dismal outlook would be hard to imagine. And then in the midst of the general gloom we can imagine some official—perhaps one who had been secretly reading Walter Lippmann—getting up and speaking in somewhat the following vein: Despair not, gentlemen. All is not lost. Mr. Khrushchev has said both in public speeches and in private conversations that he is willing and even anxious to guarantee the free status of West Berlin. That would get us off the hook. We have talked loud and long about protecting the freedom and prosperity of West Berlin, and our first concern is to make good. But let's face it, we can do so only in agreement with the Soviets, not against them. Naturally, Mr. K wants something in return for getting us off the hook in Berlin: he wants international recognition of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the existence and boundaries of his East German satellite. Of course, I admit that that wouldn't be the pleasantest pill for us to swallow, but let's be realistic about it. We know, even if we haven't said so in public, that reunification of Germany in the foreseeable future is a pipe dream of West German politicians, and we also know that East Germany's boundaries were for all practical purposes fixed at Potsdam. The honest truth of the matter is that we have little to lose by publicly recognizing these facts. And make no mistake, gentlemen, we have an awful lot to gain. For reasons which I don't have to remind you of, we have gotten ourselves into as nasty a bind in Berlin as one can well imagine. If we don't get out of it, the *best* that can happen to us is that we shall be disgraced and humiliated in the eyes of the world. Khrushchev is offering us a way out—for a price, to be sure. I'm all for bargaining to keep the price as low as possible, but I say that whatever we finally have to pay in the way of recognizing the facts of life in Eastern Europe will be well spent.

We needn't carry the fantasy further; we may even prefer to suppose that the compelling logic of these arguments imposed itself directly on Messrs. Kennedy, Rusk, et al after their minds had been somewhat cleared of fog and cant by the events of August 13th. At any rate, it was not long before the cumbersome bureaucratic machinery of Washington began to grind out hints of a turn in American policy, all pointing toward a new willingness to negotiate an agreement that would give Khrushchev the substance of what he wants in return for suitable guarantees of the future independence of West Berlin. During the latter part of September and the first days of October, there was a notable relaxation of tensions, and some of the more optimistic (or incautious) pundits began to assume that a settlement was as good as in the bag.

With the lessons of August 13th at least partly learned and a decision in principle to negotiate apparently having been taken, it might indeed have been expected that Washington would now proceed to the next stage—the opening of negotiations. But nothing of the sort has happened. Rusk's and Kennedy's long talks with Gromyko were carefully labelled exploratory, and Kennedy in his press conference of October 11th

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

went out of his way to deny that any basis of negotiations had been found or was even in sight; at the same time he stressed the danger of war and boasted of the $6-billion expansion of the military budget which his administration had put into effect since January. Further talks (*not* negotiations) would be carried on in Moscow by Ambassador Thompson. "I don't think," said the President, "that we can come to any conclusion as to what the ultimate outcome will be."

Why this rather sudden bogging down of what seemed to be developing as a hopeful initiative from Washington? Soviet readiness to negotiate has long been a matter of record, and no one has claimed that Gromyko introduced any new elements into the picture in this latest round of talks. Moreover, every knowledgeable observer, not to mention officials of the various governments concerned, now understands the general nature of the *quid* and the *quo* around which negotiations must revolve: for the West release from the Berlin trap, for the East regularization of the international status of East Germany. Why not get down to business?

The reason, which very few Americans seem to understand as yet, is that Washington *cannot* seriously negotiate with Moscow without first going through with an agonizing reappraisal of its policy toward West Germany. And there are no signs that such a reappraisal has even begun, let alone been carried through. Let us consider this more closely.

West Germany is a creation of the Western Allies, primarily the United States as the dominant one among them. It was conjured up out of the ruins of World War II to play the role of spearhead of a military alliance whose whole aim was to roll back Communist power to the 1939 borders of the USSR. Adenauer was installed as the head of a right-wing nationalist government; the rebuilding of the *Wehrmacht* was spurred on as rapidly as the sensibilities of Western Europe would permit; not only East Germany but the trans-Oder-Neisse provinces of the old Reich were claimed for Bonn; and Berlin was promised that it would once again take its place as the capital of a reunified nation. All this was begun by Truman and Acheson and continued by Eisenhower and Dulles, and it cannot be too strongly emphasized that during the period of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their ascendancy in Washington the basic policy decisions were theirs, not Adenauer's.

During this period, two things happened to change the situation. First, the Soviet Union achieved atomic weapons and the means to deliver them anywhere on earth. A basic disequilibrium in the world balance of military power was thereby rectified. By 1957 when the first sputnik was launched, the policy of rollback had already lost whatever realism it may have once possessed. But it was in precisely these same years that West Germany, rising from the ashes like the phoenix of old, regained the position of non-Soviet Europe's paramount economic and military power. In the words of the *Spiegel* editorial quoted above, "The era of Adenauer, who had been, in general, quite an obedient satrap of the West, came to an end; and the era of Strauss began." In other words, West Germany had outgrown the role of satellite and was once again ready to take its place as an independent actor on the world stage. And to match this role, Herr Strauss, the Minister of Defense, demanded, and few could doubt would sooner or later acquire, atomic weapons.

That a basic change in the situation had taken place was disguised by a number of related circumstances. America's reaction to the new world power balance was slow and reluctant. Eisenhower tried for a time to negotiate with Khrushchev but was defeated by overwhelming opposition in the American ruling class: the Dulles policies of building up West Germany for the great rollback continued to prevail. And since these were precisely to the taste of Herr Strauss, the fact that a new relation had taken shape between Washington and Bonn was completely obscured from view. Khrushchev, anxious to test the mettle of a new administration in Washington, refrained from putting the squeeze on in Berlin. During a strange interlude of a year or more, the Western alliance was saved the painful necessity of facing up to the new realities of the international scene.

That phase came to an end on August 13th. At their Vienna meeting in May, Khrushchev discovered that Kennedy was much more rigid than Eisenhower had been and drew the inevitable conclusion. "Operation Berlin" would have to be used

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to force the West to the negotiating table: the closing of the border showed that he meant business and could not be deterred by threats of military retaliation. The bankruptcy of the Acheson-Dulles policy could no longer be concealed: as related above, its continued pursuit now would mean either humiliating defeat or nuclear annihilation. The alternative was agreement with the Soviet Union. At long last, Washington awoke to its true plight and began to move toward the only possible way out. The fundamental change in the world power balance was at last beginning to work its effects.

BUT—and it is a very big but indeed—seeking agreement on Germany with the Soviet Union necessarily implies a changed attitude toward West Germany as well. Bonn would have to be told to give up the dream of reunification, to drop its efforts to make West Berlin a part of the West German state, to endorse the Oder-Neisse line, to accept the reality of the East German state—in a word, to reverse all the basic policies which West Germany was originally created to pursue. *It is hardly an exaggeration to say that West Germany would have to be told to change its very nature.* Ten years ago, perhaps even five years ago, when Adenauer was still "an obedient satrap of the West," it might have been possible. But what about today, in the Strauss era, when West Germany is already the most powerful nation of capitalist Europe? Can Washington still issue orders to Bonn and expect to be obeyed? Or, like Frankenstein, have we created a monster we can no longer control? And if indeed we have created a monster, what role can it be expected to play in deciding the outcome of the present crisis?

Unfortunately, there can hardly be any doubt about the answers to all but the last of these questions. West German independence is a fact; it rests not on legal theories and conventions but on the most solid kind of economic and military foundations. Up to the present, there has been little urge to exercise it: the policies of Washington and Bonn have coincided. But if the United States now wants West Germany to stop being a restless, ambitious, aggressive imperialist power, to accept the outcome of World War II as final, to settle down to a humdrum life of peaceful coexistence with her neighbors, then let us be perfectly clear about it: there is not the slightest reason to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expect West German acquiescence. We *have* created a Frankenstein monster we can no longer control.

When it comes to the role the monster will play in the weeks and months ahead, we enter a much more speculative realm. For the present, we will confine ourselves to noting certain possibilities without any attempt to assess the related probabilities.

To begin with, however, one *im*possibility must be disposed of, that Bonn would agree to the kind of settlement which the Soviet Union is now seeking and which Washington is beginning to understand would accord with the real interests of the United States. Such an action, as indicated above, would contradict the nature of the West German state. It simply isn't in the cards.

If such a settlement with West German approval must be ruled out as impossible, what *is* possible?

First, that Washington, fearing a breach of Western unity, would refuse to enter serious negotiations with the Soviet Union. In other words, that instead of controlling the monster we would be controlled by it. In that case, the Berlin squeeze would almost certainly be progressively tightened, and the West would face the grim choice already outlined: humiliating defeat or atomic holocaust. If, as appears not unlikely, Washington should at some later stage recoil from following this road to one or the other of its bitter ends, then the question of negotiating with the Soviet Union would once again come up and matters would stand substantially as they do today.

Second, Washington might decide to risk the breach in Western unity and proceed to negotiations with the Soviet Union anyway (legally speaking, of course, a German settlement is wholly within the competence of the four occupying powers). If this should happen, there can be little doubt that a new and complicated situation would arise. The West German ruling class could hardly help drawing the conclusion that it had got all it could expect to get from the Western alliance, and that rather than sit by and watch others negotiate with Moscow it had better do its own negotiating.

What might happen after that hardly needs to be spelled out for those whose memories reach back as far as 1939.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But history need not repeat itself, not if its lessons are properly learned. Stalin didn't conclude his pact with Germany until he was absolutely convinced that there was no hope of forging an alliance with the Western powers to contain resurgent German militarism. Khrushchev (or whoever his successor may be in the Kremlin) is not likely to either. The decision for or against such an alliance must, however, be made in Washington, not in Moscow.

While we are waiting to see which turn events are likely to take, we would do well to keep always in mind that the West German Frankenstein monster exists and that nothing short of a real alliance between the United States and the Soviet Union could render it harmless. It may sound strange to say such things at a time when America and Russia are apparently locked in mortal combat. Truth, as the saying rightly reminds us, is often stranger than fiction.

(October 16, 1961)

It is blatantly untrue to say that our willingness to negotiate stems from weakness and irresolution. It stems from an increasingly clear realization that the only conceivable way of protecting West Berlin and of achieving an orderly development in all of Germany, and security in Central Europe, is to negotiate with the Soviet Union. The objectives of the West cannot be achieved by war, which would destroy all of Europe. They cannot be achieved by threats or by bluff, or by deceiving ourselves into thinking that if we bluff grandly enough, Khrushchev will not know that we are bluffing, and will then throw up his hands.

—*Walter Lippmann, New York Herald Tribune, October* 24, 1961

Letter from Canada

. . . Have you heard of a very disturbing episode in Calgary, Alberta? A girl, who had recently visited Cuba under the auspices of the Fair Play for Cuba group, made a speech as an invited guest to a Knights of Columbus lunch. Her first-hand report was favorable to Castro and was reported in the local press. The result was her immediate dismissal from her job as draughtsman with a Calgary firm because—and no bones were made about it—of her "pro-Communist" views. The employer's excuse: many U. S. oil companies in Calgary were customers of his and he had been warned that his business would suffer if he did not get rid of her.

The only good thing about the whole affair was the sympathetic news and editorial coverage by the press and CBS television. At least it indicated that this sort of thing is not yet accepted by Canada without a great deal of indignation being fully and freely expressed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A MODEST PROPOSAL— LET OUR CHILDREN GO

BY JAMES R. NEWMAN

The following letter, written in the style of Jonathan Swift's famous "Modest Proposal for Preventing the Children of Poor People from being a Burden to their Parents or the Country," is reprinted by permission of the author from the Washington Post of September 25th. James Newman is a lawyer, mathematician, and one of the Editors of *Scientific American*. —The Editors

I address myself to the Eminences and the Serenities. I make them a Modest Proposal. Let our children go.

A nuclear war, which day by day seems more likely, may very well end human life. But suppose, more cheerfully, that only the people of the Northern Hemisphere are exterminated; that in the Southern Hemisphere it will still be possible, somehow, for some persons to survive. Why should we not transport our young children to these regions as a refuge? The merits and advantages of the Proposal are obvious and many as well as of the highest importance.

For first, as I cannot conceive any sane person capable of human feeling would challenge, the war to come, if war comes, is not the children's concern. Our quarrels, our bitterness, our hatreds, our fears do not possess them. Our heroes and our devils are not theirs. They have barely begun their lives, they are not ready to end them for Causes. They are too innocent and foolish to realize that death is preferable to life under alien creeds. I recall a story which Carl Sandburg told of a little girl, perhaps his granddaughter, who after hearing his description of a battle of the Civil War, observed, "Suppose they gave a war and no one came." There is no reason to suppose that children, unless forced, would come to our war.

Secondly, the conduct of the war would be so much less Burdensome if the children were removed. It would be unnecessary to yield to niceties, to observe amenities, to nurse the sick, to shield the weak, to spare the infirm. With the children gone, without the distractions and temptations of their cries and com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plaints, we could give ourselves over completely to the serious business at hand. There would be many fewer mouths to feed, less need for water and air and bandages and whole blood. Children are notoriously subject to epidemic diseases; thus a prolific source of infection would be eliminated.

The savings in money alone would be immense, and would not only pay to transport the children and maintain them until they could fend for themselves, but would leave a handsome margin for use in vigorous prosecution of the war. I have made a rough calculation for U. S. children which bears on the point. Say we take many of the children from the ages of two to twelve—the younger are too frail, the older are more stable and could be useful to us at home—then we shall have about 25 million to transport and keep. For this purpose, allow $1000 a head. The total is $25 billion, a sum well under half our annual military appropriation. Surely this is not too much to spend, considering the advantages to be gained.

Thirdly, we rid ourselves once for all of the Incubus of a shelter program. What a relief no longer to have to pretend! What a comfort simply to face the facts! No sensible person, even among scientists, believes in the efficacy of shelters. Down one goes to the well-stocked, cozy hole. Then what? There is the gentle patter of fallout on the roof; one is shielded from the blast; the light of a thousand suns (or is it now a million suns?) does not penetrate. The Lares and Penates are there. The family is snug. Father is pedalling the air-pump. Mother is preparing a tuna-fish casserole. The radio is on. Splendid. But when does one come up and what is there to come up to? Anarchy? Cannibalism? The living dead? Bloated corpses? Troublesome questions. And even more troublesome is the effect of fire and heat, a subject which none of the experts and no one in the Establishment has seen fit to discuss. I lay this omission, of course, to delicate feelings. It would, I believe, undermine morale to be reminded of the fire storms over Tokyo, Hamburg, Dresden, where a mere few thousands of tons of high explosives produced atmospheric convulsions.

Now with weapons, each of which may yield the equivalent of ten, or fifty, or 100 million tons of high explosives, the fire storm produced by a single bomb will, I am reliably informed by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an article in *Scientific American,* vaporize the structures and burn off the vegetation of an area of at least 15,000 square miles. Even in a deep shelter the occupants will be quickly barbecued. What a dreadful thing to contemplate. It is enough to make cowards of us all. The necrophiles, the bitter ones, the incandescent patriots, those among the aged and ailing who take comfort in the thought that their demise will coincide with that of mankind: these endorse the view that shelters will give shelter. But secretly they laugh at our innocence. We must not encourage them. If we are to die for the Cause, let us not cheapen and betray the sacrifice: Away with the shelters, and all will become clear.

Fourthly, there is the grave moral issue of suicide. The law forbids it to the individual. On a national scale, however, it is apparently acceptable. Do we not, after all, make the law? Thus we may write its exceptions. Still, the question nags us, can we require the suicide of those who have no voice in the making of the laws, viz. children? It is a fine point, and none would venture to say how our leaders would feel compelled to decide it. My Proposal disencumbers them of this obligation.

Fifthly, there must be many who, like myself, have a Weakness for children. In format and freshness they are much preferable to the larger editions, their parents. Children are unwrinkled, unwarped. They are healthy. They smell nice. They are not cynical. They suppose life to be an end in itself. Properly nourished, watered and cared for, they grow up. When grown they can breed. The dead do not breed. Quite recently the eminent geneticist Herman Muller described a scheme for setting up large-scale sperm banks. Sperm could be stored indefinitely; it could be classified according to the characteristics of the males who produced it. Human evolution would thus, in a sense, come under man's own control. Yet the scheme presupposes the continuance of women. It is my impression that sperm by itself will yield no fruit. Here again the Proposal is vindicated; for there will be female as well as male children: instead of storing germ plasm we will be storing the young themselves and thus assure the future.

For the moment I have said enough. I am anxious that Wise men consider my Proposal. Is it Feasible? (Less feasible,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say, than a journey to the planets?) Is it visionary? (More visionary than the preservation of Freedom by a nuclear war?) Is it too Costly? Is there yet time to execute it—in part at least if not in whole? Could it be made a matter of International Cooperation? Is a country without children worth living in? Perhaps not. In that case some better course must be found. Let the Wise men define it.

When the anti-missile becomes operational it will probably lead to further developments. Our aircraft carry air-to-air missiles for defense against enemy aircraft; an intercontinental ballistic missile might carry air-to-air missiles for defense against other missiles. These might be called anti-anti-missile missile missiles, though if we have the ingenuity to develop such weapons we may be able to think of a shorter name for them.

—*Principles of Guided Missiles and Nuclear Weapons, Bureau of Naval Personnel,* 1959

On a problem like this, Madison Avenue can't miss(ile).

No more than other people can Americans have both sides of the coin. Either we are a peace-loving people or we are not, and we had better make up our minds. If we really believe in the peace we profess, there can be no room in our policy for the imperialism of the New Militarism. If peace be our aim, the Military's objectives cannot be our objectives; there can be no room for a philosophy that calls for "the preservation and enhancement of our political system rather than the maintenance of peace," for a philosophy that dictates "we cannot tolerate the survival of a political system" inimical to our own. For a Christian people whose ideal has always been that of peace on earth and good will among men, we have bred a strange and powerful and ruthless caste that can look with equanimity upon the slaughter of the world's people by the inconceivable millions. This we must realize when we hear a Radford or a Goldwater sound the siren trumpet for a vague but glowing "total victory." They mean the incineration of the world. And the price is not theirs to pay.

—*Fred J. Cook, The Nation, October* 28, 1961

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MAN-MADE DISEASES

BY A RESEARCH PHYSICIAN

In the most highly industrialized areas of the globe and especially in the United States amazing strides have been made against many lethal human diseases. In the past two decades such diseases as tuberculosis, certain forms of pneumonia, typhoid fever, meningitis, and syphilis have been either eradicated or brought under reasonable control. These diseases are the ones that have been primarily caused by intrinsic elements of nature, such as bacteria. Although it is well established that inadequate housing, poor sanitation, malnutrition, and unregulated industrial working conditions are also significant factors in the production of human illness, these were not the basic or prime causes in the past period. The basic and primary causes were the microbes. It is clear that these germs were not placed on this earth by man, and it is also equally obvious that, apart from preparations for bacteriological warfare, man has had no consuming or vested interest in protecting or retaining them. Man therefore has used his knowledge and resources to eliminate them, and in recent years the fruits of the continuing industrial, technical, and scientific revolutions have provided many effective means for doing so. The development of antibiotics, new chemotherapeutic agents, and the increase of knowledge concerning the chemistry and biology of the microbes and their effect on the human body have to a great extent reduced the infectious diseases to a secondary place in the current spectrum of human maladies in this country.

Control or elimination of the secondary contributory environmental factors, such as poor housing, that have helped perpetuate these diseases has not been as adequately accomplished. Although much unfinished business remains in this area, housing to a certain extent has improved, nutritional standards have risen, and in this country good sanitation is generally

The author has been professionally concerned with some of the problems he discusses in this article.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

widespread. In this connection, it is important to note that the main obstacles to the development of public health agencies (leaders in the eradication of microbe-caused illness) has come from only a rather small portion of the population. For instance, in the past as well as the present, certain religious sects have fought compulsory vaccination. Small groups of individualistically minded physicians have opposed the extension of various health services for fear it would limit their income from private practice. Private tax associations at times have fought the extension of public health services in order to keep the tax rate down. However, in the main, the public as a whole has supported the extension of public health measures.

The same technological and scientific advances that are responsible for the elimination or control of such diseases as pneumonia, tuberculosis, and syphilis, however, have brought with them entirely new sets of health problems. These new problems, in fact, are beginning to constitute the major health hazards of the current period. In contrast to the previous period, these new causes of disease have never been an intrinsic or primary part of the natural environment but are essentially man-made, placed on this earth and in this country in our present culture by man himself. This new array of threats to human health arises directly from the application of these new technical advances and their associated cultural superstructure: they are related to the way we travel, to what we eat and drink, to the air we breathe, and to our habits, vices, and modes of employment.

It must be remembered in this connection that the monopolistic control of the mass media of communication by advertisers exerts a tremendous influence on what we eat, drink, smoke, and buy—the essence of what we accept as the modern American way of life, what the public health agencies refer to as "our changing environment." To illustrate the point, certain remarks made by public health authorities in a recent symposium on man and his changing environment are in order. Dr. E. Stainbrook, Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Southern California, stated "progressively we are creating for ourselves an almost totally man-made physical, social, and cultural environment." Dr. R. E. Dwork, Director of the Ohio

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Department of Health, stated at the same symposium: "A multitude of new threats of our own making confronts us. We are progressing from the battle of the bugs into the catastrophe of the chemicals. We are creating a shiny new chromium-plated and plastic-molded world which will be wonderful to look at, but some of us are beginning to wonder whether there will be a proper place for man in it. We are pouring a host of new substances into our environment and into ourselves—pesticides, weed killers, food additives, powerful but mysterious cleaning agents, neat but questionable packaging materials, pretty but possibly perilous cosmetics. About many of these chemicals we know very little. The little we know is enough to be alarming in a great many cases." In short, the fact of the social conditioning of our lives is now a basic consideration confronting medical science in the prevention and control of disease.

- In the past few years, more than two thousand industrial firms have been using radio isotopes under license from the Atomic Energy Commission. These isotopes are sources of human exposure to radiation. Yet education in the policing and enforcement of safety provisions required in the use of these isotopes is entirely inadequate. Many hospital as well as private physicians using these isotopes pay only lip service to the safety regulations, because they do not wish to incur the added expense that would be required if the safety regulations were to be rigidly adhered to.
- Uranium miners are currently in constant danger of harmful radiation exposure.
- In the past, physicians specializing in x-ray work developed certain malignant tumors and leukemia ten times more frequently than physicians not engaged in such work.
- At least 10,000 new chemical substances are produced each year in industrial developments, and little if anything is known of the toxicity to humans of most of them.
- Dr. L. Greenberg, Commissioner of Air Pollution Control of New York City, has stated that "the average person consumes 30 pounds of air a day but pays little or no attention to its quality, and yet the air over an industrial city is likely to contain sulfur dioxide, ammonia, aldehydes, oxidants, carbon monoxide, hydrogen sulfide, chlorides, and dust. Where there

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is meteorologic inversion and low wind velocity, the air pollution is transferred into smog and when the saturation point is reached, fatalities result. In other words, death may result from smog."

● The Chairman of the American Medical Association's Committee of Automobile Crash Injuries and Deaths has warned the auto industry to clean its own house and stop emphasizing speed and greater horsepower; the industry should concern itself more with safety devices and less pernicious advertising slogans. (It is also well known that almost 50 percent of traffic fatalities are caused by drunken driving.)

● The American Cancer Society has endorsed legislation to bar cancer-producing agents from being used as food additives, and has indicated that certain laws are outdated and need review.

● A special study committee of scientists appointed by the major health agencies of this country has concluded that cigarette smoking is the major cause of lung cancer in males in this country and that review of all scientific evidence was conclusive.

● There is increasing scientific evidence that excessive dietary intake of animal fats and dairy products may be one of the key factors in the cause of coronary artery disease, the major cause of death in the adult male population. The American Heart Association has issued a recent statement to this effect.

From a socio-economic point of view the importance of lung cancer and coronary artery disease may be appreciated when it is realized that in this part of the world, the death rate for males over the age of fifty is twice that of females, and that these two diseases account for almost the entire difference in the respective death rates.

● Pesticide residues have been found in marketed fluid milk, and exposure to other organic pesticides has produced toxic symptoms in agricultural workers.

● An increasing array of physician-produced diseases is also part of the disturbing picture, for example those produced by indiscreet use of inadequately tested drugs, over-use of antibiotics, and indiscriminate use of transfusions.

The foregoing situations represent but a small cross-sec-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional sampling of a constantly expanding set of problems. All, it may be noted, are medical situations produced by man and his social arrangements.

It is true, as already indicated, that leaders in the field of public health are for the most part aware of these problems. However, their approach to solutions is along purely administrative lines. In most instances, the real scope and magnitude of the measures necessary now and in the near future to combat this alarming rise in man-made sickness is only barely appreciated. The reason may be a lack of full understanding or a recognition that political discretion may be the better part of valor, for the problems collide head-on with vested interests.

Up to now no one has formulated adequate criteria for the general guarantee of safety in the use of food additives. Very few cities have accurate means for the proper determination of air pollution. These problems call for more research expenditures and more rigid control of industry. To industry this means higher taxes, more expense, and less profit.

Imagine for a moment that it were conclusively proven that animal fats and dairy fats eaten in excess are the major causes of heart attacks. This would mean that in order to prevent this disease less ice cream would be consumed, the intake of butter curtailed, less meat eaten, etc. It would mean that such slogans as "Drink a quart of milk a day for your health" would not only be false but harmful. Imagine then the necessary struggle against the dairy trusts, the Madison Avenue advertising firms, and the cultural eating habits of the people, if one were to make serious inroads into the occurrence of this disease. What would happen to the custard and fat-meat hamburger stands? The Commissioner of Health in a dairy-farming state like New York would be timid, as indeed he is, about advocating a change in the dietary habits of the people.

Another example of this type of conflict has already been alluded to in connection with cigarette smoking and lung cancer. The tobacco industry has set up its own scientific council to befuddle the public, and through its vast expenditures on advertising, effectively influences most mass means of communication. In this instance, the fight against cancer has involved questions of censorship on radio and television as a result of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which even the American Cancer Society on its own paid time cannot freely discuss the subject. United States Senators from Southern tobacco producing states have attempted to intimidate government-supported scientists who have dared to incriminate cigarette smoking as an important health hazard.

The drive of the automobile industry to sell more and more cars each year leads to enticing advertising that stresses greater horsepower and more speed, despite the fact that there are 50,000 deaths and many more disabling injuries on our highways each year from high speed accidents. Better highways with added safety precautions, strict enforcement of drunken driving laws, requirements for safety features in cars—all these things mean higher taxes, more expense, and less profits. The complexities in the fight to prevent these deaths are all to plain.

Although there has been some modification of the laws under which the Food and Drug Administration operates, they are still entirely inadequate to cope with the increasing and almost indiscriminate employment of food additives and preservatives. The National Canners Association has stated that it is "adamantly opposed to having any federal agency determine what the American consumer likes or dislikes or what serves useful purposes in any food." Here again the fight is not against any element of nature, such as the tubercle bacillus, but against man-made organizations with vested interests.

The possible scope of the problem created by commercial additives in the production and preservation of food was recently suggested by an event in the fish industry. In certain commercial fish hatcheries it was noted that hundreds of thousands of trout had developed cancer of the liver at two years of age. This has now been traced to a commercial alteration of the diet of these fish. Aside from the losses to the fish industry, the implications relative to human diseases are profound. Apparently immediately innocent additives may have serious consequences which may not be manifest until many years have passed, and the situation at this later date is often entirely irreversible.

Physicians themselves have contributed immensely to the problem of man-made disease by indiscriminately and often unjustifiably using antibiotics, thus promoting the development of strains of bacteria resistant to drugs and altering the human

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being's resistance and sensitivity to both drugs and germs. It may very well be that a somewhat facetious remark made 15 years ago by Dr. Hans Zinser in his book entitled *Rats, Lice and History* may contain more than a germ of truth. To a certain extent, he wrote, it may be harmful to treat syphilis by drugs, because in this way we are tampering with the long-range development of natural human resistance. No one, of course, would oppose the treatment of syphilis, but there is profound wisdom in the remark all the same.

It is important to realize, of course, that many additives are beneficial. One should also understand that many crackpots or individuals with a particular axe to grind seize upon some of these situations to confuse the public, as for example those who have tried to prevent fluoridation of our water supply.

The all-important problem of the poisoning of the earth's atmosphere with radioactive substances through bomb testing is of such magnitude as to defy adequate discussion in a brief commentary. This man-made situation is perhaps the greatest threat to human health the earth has ever faced. Yet what has been the approach of the medical profession? The approach has been strictly along the narrowest of medical lines, such as "let us limit the amount of diagnostic x-rays that we impose on our patients in order to limit their exposure to radiation." This approach is comparable to an attempt to empty the Atlantic Ocean with a teaspoon.

These narrow and antiquated approaches to the modern problems of health can accomplish relatively little whether it be a question of radiation, traffic fatalities, air pollution, or any of the other man-made dangers to health. Since these problems are man-made and involve man against man (his organizations, habits, politics, businesses, etc.), only a total *social* approach, with all of its implications, can assure our ability in the future to prevent a reasonable number of disabilities and deaths from this vast group of health hazards. Ever since man's first appearance on earth, the problems of his health have been connected with his mode of life in some way, but never with the intensity and directness of today. Sooner or later, medical science cannot avoid a new approach which must of necessity concern itself with changes in our social and economic environment.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ECONOMIC PLANNING IN BLACK AFRICA

BY CHARLES BETTELHEIM

We are told that the year 1960 was the year of independence in Black Africa. In a political sense, this is true; but it is certainly not true in an economic sense. Economic independence for Black Africa will come about only gradually, on the basis of a long and sustained development effort. In Black Africa, the problems of economic development are identified with those of the struggle for real independence, the struggle for economic independence.

* * *

The dependence of one country on one or several others is due not only to the inadequate level of development of its productive forces. It is due also to the internal structure of its economy, to the deformations which this structure may have suffered under the influence of a foreign economy. These deformations result in the stagnation or even retrogression of important branches of the economy and in the partial development and eventual hypertrophy of other branches which depend principally on external markets.

All this confers upon the problems of economic development in Africa an importance of the first rank, with respect to both the welfare of the African populations and the place which Africa will be called upon to occupy on the economic and political world scene.

The nature of the development problems facing Africa and of their possible solutions is obviously determined by the special characteristics of the colonial economy of Black Africa. It is therefore useful to begin our discussion by examining these special characteristics.

Professor Bettelheim, Director of Studies at the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes of the Sorbonne, Paris, is the chief author of the three-year plan under which the Republic of Guinea is now operating. This is an abridged version of an article which appeared in Cahiers Internationaux.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Special Characteristics of the Economy of Black Africa

The various countries of Black Africa, or at least the French-speaking ones, have enough common traits to enable us to speak of the special characteristics of the economy of Black Africa. This does not mean that in one country or another certain of these characteristics may not be more or less marked. But in spite of this, the overall picture undoubtedly remains valid for each of these countries in particular.

The first common trait of the countries of Black Africa is the predominance of agriculture. This predominance, obviously, does not mean a high degree of development; on the contrary, the level of productivity in agriculture is low. The techniques utilized are extremely inefficient. The necessary correlation between crops and livestock is generally ignored. The predominance of agricultural activity is therefore in terms of the number of persons involved rather than the importance of the income created by the agricultural sector.

A second common characteristic, more specific than the first, is the survival, at least in a formal sense, of traditional institutions. These have preserved their motivational power and their cultural prestige, but at the same time they have been largely drained of their past economic and social content. This internal mutation, which may be more or less advanced in one or another country of Black Africa, occurred principally under the influence of colonization, of the development of a money economy, and of certain new market crops. Thus attacked simultaneously from the outside in the sphere of distribution, and from the inside through the introduction of new crops, the old institutions have deteriorated and their content has been modified. This is clearly evident in the change which has taken place in the manner of exploitation both of the land itself and of its products. Thus, new social relationships have come into being which are not always immediately apparent since they are masked by the forms of the old institutions, but which exist all the same. This means that the dominant capitalist economy has corrupted an ancient system from which the exploitation of man by man was absent and has introduced such exploitation under a devious guise, which is not directly recognizable but is nevertheless real. It is this de-

(*continued on page* 314)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With the question of disarmament about to be debated at the UN, one book should be on your must list. It is FROM YALTA TO DISARMAMENT by J. P. Morray. It is a long book, very expensive for us to manufacture. Publication date was August 23 and the list price was $8.50. Many MR readers were fortunate in buying the book at the pre-publication price but others, not so fortunate, delayed purchase and $8.50 is too steep a price for them to pay. We want them to read the book so we are offering it as a Christmas Special at a reduced price until December 31.

We want new subscriptions. If MR is as valuable as many of you write us it is, then more people should be reading it. You can get us new subs, and educate your friends, and solve your Christmas gift problems by taking advantage of the special offers on this page.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Specials

1. *From Yalta to Disarmament*

by J. P. Morray

List price $8.50 . . . . . Special price $5

2. *The Yalta book* plus a *new* sub

Regular price $13.50 . . . . . Special price $8.50

FREE GIFTS FOR NEW SUBS

3. A clothbound copy of the first edition of

Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution

by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy

will be sent you **FREE** for every **new** sub you send in at the regular price of $5.

4. *Tide Without Turning*

by John Gill

The first full treatment in print of the dramatic story of Elijah Lovejoy. This clothbound book will be sent you **FREE** for every **new** sub you send in at the regular price of $5.

Please note: These sub offers **do not apply to renewals**—only to new subs. All offers expire December 31, 1961.

Gift slips enclosed according to your directions.

Extra Bonus: A copy of our special July-August issue, **Cuba and Communism,** will be included with every one of the 4 specials above. (Solves still another Christmas Gift problem.)

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue N. Y. 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from page* 311)

gradation of old institutions which has made the problem of age groups and the problem of women as acute as they are today. The existence of these deteriorated, corroded institutions cannot be ignored when confronting the question of the conditions of rapid economic and social progress, which implies the multiplication of initiative and the existence of real democracy.

A third specific common characteristic, closely tied to the first two, is the weakness in the urban development of towns and of classes in general, resulting in the underdevelopment of the African bourgeoisie. Such weak bourgeois elements as do exist in Black Africa are dependent on imperialism for the foreign markets to which they export their raw products and for the supply of consumer goods of industrial origin which they sell in the African countryside.

This dependence has an ambivalent significance: on the one hand it drives these elements to free themselves of their dependence, and on the other hand it often encourages them to maintain the already established ties on which rests the relative prosperity of their business. Although numerically unimportant, the existence of these bourgeois elements in commerce (and also in transport) cannot be ignored if one wants to obtain an overall view of the effective structure of the present economy of Africa. These elements quite often occupy a strategic position, since they have in their hands the networks through which commodities are gathered and distributed and they realize profits which, in the aggregate, make up an appreciable fraction of the cash portion of the national income.

A fourth specific common trait is the domination of big business and wholesale trade and a large part of the semi-wholesale trade by foreign capital. This domination occurs essentially in two forms: on the one hand, in a minor form, through the insertion into the commercial networks of traders who have come from abroad but have established themselves in African countries—generally traders of Syrian and Lebanese origin; on the other hand, and more fundamentally, in the form of big trading firms which perform a major part of the import and export operations and which make considerable profits through these operations. These profits usually do not figure in the national

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accounts of the countries concerned, since they are realized outside of their borders.

A fifth specific trait consists in the establishment of extractive industries, which, at least in French-speaking Africa, is of recent origin. This has given rise to economic enclaves which undergo an autonomous development closely linked to the international market but which are virtually without influence on the internal development of the African countries.

Capitalism: Obstacle to the Development of Productive Forces

All these specific traits together contribute to the very low level of development of productive forces. This manifests itself particularly in the levels of agricultural output which are among the lowest in the world. As a corollary, the internal market is hardly developed. This phenomenon is further aggravated by the low population density which puts a considerable burden on the costs of internal transport and of distribution in general.

Another result of these specific traits is strong resistance to technological innovation: the traditional institutions of the African countryside, even in their deformed state, are not receptive to innovation. On the contrary, they offer considerable resistance by virtue of the modes of tenure and of the predominance, whenever decision-making is involved, of older people who are usually not disposed to welcome changes, whether they be of a social or technological nature.

Another result, finally, of these specific traits, is the harsh exploitation of the productive Africans. The most apparent and most shocking form of this exploitation occurs through the price mechanism, that is, at the level of the commercialization of production. Products are bought from the African producer at a price much lower than that prevailing on the world market and are resold by foreign capital on the French or international markets at a large profit. This results in the appropriation by foreign capitalists (who control the final stages of the flow of commerce) of an important part of the value created by the African producers. It is true that part of the profits realized at the expense of the African producers is absorbed by the intermediary stages of African traders themselves and by foreign traders established in Africa, but these profits constitute only a small portion

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the profits realized by capitalist big business and by the banks which finance its operations.

Mercantile exploitation is particularly typical of the situation in French-speaking Black Africa. This is further intensified by the existence of the "cordon sanitaire" which the franc zone has thrown around Black Africa, the general effect of which is to impede easy access to the international market and hence to place Africans in a position of very strict dependence on the big French commercial firms.

The economic and social situation which we have very briefly described obviously makes for a situation particularly favorable to the development of internal tensions. Some of these are of strictly economic origin, as for instance, the dissatisfaction of the African producer or trader with respect to Syrian-Lebanese capital or big foreign capital. But another and deeper source of such tensions lies in the wounds which colonialism has inflicted upon the feelings of dignity and human respect which animate the peoples of Africa. This is the most powerful source of the anti-imperialist sentiment which has emerged throughout Black Africa in recent years.

The anti-imperialist struggle of the masses which has thus come into being is of far-reaching significance: unlike the anti-imperialist struggles carried on by certain national bourgeoisies, it is not corrupted from the inside by the desire for money and profit. It derives, more than anything else, from a will to dignity, a will to progress, a will to a better life shared by all. Of course, the development of commercial contacts and the appearance on the economic horizon of industrial products have changed the aspirations of the African population and have demonstrated the possibilities opened up by economic and industrial development.

These new perspectives are particularly attractive for young people who, in addition, feel that in the absence of overall industrial and economic development their future threatens to be limited. The young elements of the population aspire more strongly to the economic and social transformation which, in their view, must follow the political freedom acquired during these recent years.

Today, these various tensions and aspirations render necessary an accelerated economic and social development. Such a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

development is required by the necessity to realize true economic independence, as well as by the pressure of different social aspirations and feelings and also by the beginning of a demographic push which calls for the industrialization of Africa if grave difficulties are to be avoided in the future.

Fortunately, great objective possibilities confront these aspirations and requirements.

Africa possesses immense natural wealth. Knowledge is still very limited, but the discoveries which have already been made (iron ore, bauxite, immense reserves of hydro-electric power, oil, etc.) presage the vast perspectives which will open up for the African economy of tomorrow.

However, between these aspirations and the objective possibilities of satisfying them, considerable obstacles intervene. These obstacles consist in the size of the financial effort needed to activate the natural wealth of Africa. They consist also in the need for advanced technical equipment which Africa does not produce, the need for qualified cadres of engineers of which Africa has been deprived by her colonial status, the need to develop skilled workers for rapid economic and industrial development, etc.

The existence of these obstacles imposes narrow limits on economic growth if it is to take place under capitalist conditions. Such growth would run afoul of the extraordinary resistance of internal structures opposed to the rapid development of agricultural production and of the internal market. As a result the possibilities of development would be limited to a few industries, mainly extractive and operating for the export market. As is well known, this type of development does not lead to a general improvement in welfare; and it perpetuates—even aggravates—the economic dependence of the country in which it takes place.

Furthermore, the capitalist way of development, in the specific conditions of the African economy, would lead to the waste of a large portion of the economic surplus, which would either be appropriated by foreign capitalists or by a local bourgeoisie disposing of the few opportunities for productive investments. It could hardly be otherwise so long as the internal and essentially rural market remains narrowly limited by the stagnation of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agriculture and stifled by productive relationships hostile to rapid economic growth.

It is with these conditions in mind—the conditions of the Africa of today—that we must approach the problems of development and planning in the African countries.

Development and Planning

From the above, it follows that the problems of development in Africa will not and cannot be solved unless the old institutions spawned by colonialism are overthrown, whether they take the form of traditional institutions suffering from internal corruption, or of the externally imposed institutions of the colonial period.

The institutional transformations necessary for the economic development of Black Africa imply, first of all, that foreign commerce should come under the control of a public agency, with the state centralizing the essential import and export transactions and thus at the same time centralizing the commercial profits which were previously realized by private interests.

These institutional changes also imply the establishment of a system of internal trade controlled by the state, at least at the level of wholesale and semi-wholesale trade; and the construction, at the retail level, of a network of suppliers' cooperatives to insure that neither the producers nor the consumers are exploited by private traders. The profits realized through these commercial operations will have to be centralized and made available for national investment without which overall economic development is impossible.

Money and credit, of course, cannot be allowed to remain in the hands of foreigners but will have to be placed under the direct control of the state through the creation of a national bank charged with issuing money, controlling exchange, and making credit available according to a pre-established plan.

In the fields of fiscal and mining legislation, corporation law, and the regulation of foreign investments, the heritage of the colonial period must be rejected. The countries of Africa must put in its place a new fiscal system, adapted to the requirements of development. Foreign capital must be deprived of its freedom of action, since it is concerned not with overall economic development but only with maximizing profits in particu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lar sectors of the economy. If these highly profitable sectors are occupied by foreign capital, they do not contribute, as they should, to the capital accumulation which the countries of Africa most urgently need.

Structural reform, obviously, must also encompass agrarian institutions. The relationships of production in the villages must be profoundly altered in order to make possible the development of a modern and productive agriculture, particularly by spurring the establishment of democratically functioning cooperative organizations. This implies social changes within the village and a resolute political will. It would be illusory to create such cooperatives in a bureaucratic manner; they would not function and would not contribute to the real development of productive forces. The establishment of new rural institutions is one of the most important responsibilities of the young political parties of the countries of Africa.

Along with the creation of institutions favoring development, it is indispensable to undertake the most complete survey possible of natural resources. Colonialism has never done much in this area, investigating only those sources of wealth the appropriation of which might interest capitalists in the metropolitan countries.

Many other resources necessary or useful to the diversified internal development of these countries, are still unknown. This is particularly true of the resources of the land. Investigation of soils and water availability must have particularly high priority. This is a vast problem which it will take several years to solve and it should therefore be tackled as quickly as possible.

Mineral resources are the foundations on which the industrial development of Africa can be built. Geological prospecting must be undertaken very rapidly. At first this will have to be done with the help of foreign geologists, but as soon as possible the work will be taken over by Africans whose training must receive priority during the next few years. Mineral resources must under no circumstances be turned over to foreign companies even if they should agree to treaties apparently advantageous to the countries of Africa. Foreigners are interested only in making profits from selling African minerals on the international market, and would leave only a small fraction of the realized profits in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the hands of the African states. More than anywhere else, the establishment of a state sector is indispensable in mining.

Without knowledge of a country's resources and in the absence of adequate economic statistics, it is of course impossible to formulate a comprehensive, long-range development plan. In the meantime, it is necessary to draw up transitional plans of no more than three or four years' duration which would have as their objectives (1) to create the institutional framework for a planned economy, (2) to acquire the information needed for later planning efforts, and (3) to speed up as much as possible within existing limits the growth of agriculture and industry.

The necessity of planning, given the present situation of the African economies, results from the need to decide upon and respect certain priorities, and the need to maintain a balance between available resources and their uses. But it would be quite illusory to attempt to treat the problem of balances in detail, not only because of inadequate economic knowledge but also, and no less importantly, because of the existence of hidden productive potentials that may suddenly materialize under the stimulus of political power.

In these circumstances, it is necessary most of all to strive for overall balances and not to forget that planning does not stop with the drafting of a plan, but consists also—and particularly—in the implementation of the projects initially conceived. Such implementation must take firmly into account the priorities adopted, and must follow closely the possibilities of real economic evolution in order to be able to deal at the proper time with the inbalances which result from the unforeseen expansion of certain productive forces, or with unforeseen difficulties in the realization of the plan in certain sectors. What is indispensable here is constant vigilance so that the implementation of the plan may always be adapted to real economic evolution, an evolution impossible to predict given the present state of statistical knowledge and in a situation which must be characterized by profound institutional transformations.

Priorities and Factors Making for Success

It clearly follows from the foregoing that the first priority must be accorded to the radical transformation of institutions. It

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be a radical transformation because only in this way can the colonial condition be truly transcended; only thus can the economic dependence be dissolved which still subjects yesterday's colonies to imperialism. Unless the present stagnation of agriculture can be overcome, unless the parasitic elements can be eliminated from the urban economy, future development is certain to be characterized, as in the past, by distortion and deformity and eventually to be brought to a full stop.

But institutional change must also be radical for another reason. In its absence there is always the danger that future development will give rise to new forms of exploitation of man by man, whether on the basis of private capitalism or of a bureaucratic type of capitalism. For this reason it is crucially important that the state sector and the cooperatives should evolve under conditions of real democracy. This is the only way to prevent the economic surplus created by the productive labor of the country from being monopolized by a few privileged groups taking advantage of their position as private capitalists or of strategic positions in the state apparatus. Experience shows that this last danger is far from being unreal and that it is indispensable to foresee it in order to be able to forestall it.

A second high-priority requirement is, obviously, the training of men. Colonialism has resulted in Africa's being by-passed by the vast progress of knowledge which has marked the 19th and 20th centuries. While in Europe and in the northern half of the New World elementary education became everywhere compulsory, while secondary schools and universities multiplied, Africa was left out of the main stream. Today, she suffers in this respect from a delay which she must overcome in the shortest possible time. Any economic development which attempted to base itself solely on important capital investments, while overlooking the work of training men, would necessarily be doomed to failure.

In the initial stage of development, that which Black Africa is today beginning, priority must therefore be given to the development of primary education and to the fight against illiteracy. At the same time, secondary and technical schools must be developed and measures must be taken which will allow the African countries to have their own universities as rapidly as possible.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the economic domain properly speaking, first place must be given to the improvement of the standard of living of the people through progress in agriculture and especially through the development of food crops which have been so neglected by colonialism in favor of commercial crops destined to be exported and as a source of profits to the big companies. This progress in agriculture will result from the conjunction of technological and political forces.

In the technical sphere, it is the diffusion of new knowledge and new means of production which will create the objective foundations for progress in production. But in the complementary political sphere it is the formation of political and technical cadres and the establishment of cooperatives which will create the framework without which new techniques cannot be effectively introduced.

In the effort to improve the standard of living, emphasis must be placed equally on the satisfaction of collective and of individual needs. By collective needs, we mean, in this connection, needs in the matter of health, education, and personal culture. This emphasis is justified if it is desired to prevent the economic development of Africa from being accompanied by the proliferation of individualism which is foreign to Africa and which would be profoundly contrary to the requirements of a planned and harmonious overall economic development.

The diversification of foreign trade is also one of the priorities in the development efforts of the countries of Africa during the coming years. This diversification must be accomplished both with respect to products—Africa must cease to export only a few commodities—and with respect to the trading partners—African countries must no longer trade only with their imperialist overlords, but with the largest possible number of foreign countries.

The first steps on the road to a planned economy must also be the first steps on the road to the industrialization of Africa. These are relatively easy to define since it is a question of substituting national products for imports, of gradually realizing possibilities in the field of energy and particularly hydro-electricity, of beginning to exploit certain of the most readily accessible and most easily recoverable mineral resources.

Along with these first steps on the road to industrialization,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must go preparations for that basic industrialization which alone will assure to Africa its full economic development and the welfare to which it is entitled.

To this end a long-term and sufficiently detailed plan will be indispensable. It will have to be worked out during the coming years on the basis of more complete knowledge of the natural resources and the economic and social realities of these countries.

The Search for the Socialist Way in Africa

In sum, it is within the limits created by the extent of domestic capital formation and by the requirements of the various priorities mentioned above that it is possible to determine the objectives of a national development plan and the magnitude of reasonably acceptable foreign aid.

It is clear, of course, that beyond a certain limit, what appears as aid may turn out to be the contrary. Apart from the economic and political strings which may justify the rejection of certain types of assistance which are in reality only a means of perpetuating the dependence of African countries, we must keep in mind the long-term effects of aid—devoid of strings, when such aid exceeds a certain amount.

These effects may be of several kinds. If a country has difficulty making repayment when due, it is put in a position of inferiority and dependence. Further, too much foreign aid can cause a lopsided development giving rise to tensions and disequilibria which may have inflationary consequences. Finally, if foreign aid is disproportionately large compared to domestic accumulation, the result may be excessive expansion of certain lines of activity. In order to absorb the foreign aid now, in other words, some sectors of the economy may be enlarged beyond the size eventually called for when capital investment is limited solely by domestic savings.

In the preparation of the long-term plans which in a few years will be indispensable to Africa, an important place must of course be reserved for the great projects which Africans of various countries will undertake in common. These projects will constitute the material foundations on which African unity will be built.

In this connection, it is necessary to emphasize how illusory

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and even dangerous are the conceptions of African unity through the mechanism of a "common market." This, in effect, would only open up Africa to foreign investment and would perpetuate its dependence on imperialism. It would also threaten to sow the seeds of future dissension among African countries by favoring the relatively more prosperous countries to the detriment of the poorer ones. The real unity of Africa can be realized only through a common effort, a great constructive work which will jointly mobilize the energies of several African countries in the realization of great projects contributing to the improvement of living standards and to the strengthening of the economic power of all.

The problems of rapid development in Black Africa are the result of economic and social conditions peculiar to Africa, as well as of the situation of the world economy in this second half of the 20th century and of the requirements of a modern society and a modern economy, requirements which are common to all of humanity.

We might as well realize that Africans are facing the same choice as the rest of mankind in our time: socialism or capitalism, that is to say, social control of the forces of production in the service of the welfare of all, or the exploitation of these forces for the profit of some individuals, leading to the stagnation of the standard of living of the majority of the people, to the underutilization of modern techniques and even, as in the imperialist countries, to their partial transformation into forces of destruction.

Africa cannot escape this choice. Only a racist approach could lead to the belief that Africans do not have the same problems to solve as the rest of mankind.

True, the stages through which progress toward socialism can or must be reached are necessarily determined by the specific conditions of each country and each people. But the great choices are the same for all of humanity. This must not be forgotten in the creation of institutions of development and in the launching of the first planning efforts in Black Africa, and the most knowledgeable of the African leaders are perfectly aware of it.

For the rest, the fundamental guarantee of success of every development effort is not technical but political.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If planning begins with a technical assessment of possibilities, balances, and goals, it ends in political and social action.

The success of a plan is determined in the shops, in the fields, and in the factories.

The realization of an economic plan is a great collective effort. It must be inspired and sustained by political cadres. On them, on their awareness of the problems, on their constant contact with the masses whom they help to move forward but from whom they must also learn, depends, in the end result, the success or failure of a plan.

This is why the future of Africa depends on the determination to scrap the old institutions inherited from colonialism and to replace them with new structures; why it depends on a vigilant political attitude towards economic and social evolution, determined to avoid any deviation from a straight line once adopted; why it depends on the conscious acceptance of this straight line by the African masses. It is this acceptance and this effort of the masses which will ultimately assure the success of the plans of development and of economic and social transformation of the countries of Africa.

Although most Africans are poor, our continent is potentially extremely rich. Our mineral resources, which are being exploited with foreign capital only to enrich foreign investors, range from gold and diamonds to uranium and petroleum. Our forests contain some of the finest woods to be grown anywhere. Our cash crops include cocoa, coffee, rubber, tobacco and cotton. As for power, which is an important factor in any economic development, Africa contains over 40% of the total potential water power of the world, as compared with about 10% in Europe and 13% in North America. Yet so far, less than 1% has been developed. This is one of the reasons why we have in Africa the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty, and scarcity in the midst of abundance.

Never before have a people had within their grasp so great an opportunity for developing a continent endowed with so much wealth. Individually, the independent states of Africa, some of them potentially rich, others poor, can do little for their people. Together, by mutual help, they can achieve much. But the economic development of the continent must be planned and pursued as a whole. A loose confederation designed only for economic co-operation would not provide the necessary unity of purpose. Only a strong political union can bring about full and effective development of our natural resources for the benefit of our people.

—*Kwame Nkrumah, I Speak of Freedom,* 1961

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Two Empty Chairs

President Kennedy and Senator Fulbright (Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee) spoke their minds during September 1961. The President made a carefully prepared address to the United Nations General Assembly on September 25. The Senator's statement was printed in the October issue of *Foreign Affairs*. President Kennedy made an earnest plea for disarmament under United Nations direction as the only means of avoiding the catastrophe of a nuclear war. Senator Fulbright called for a strengthened North Atlantic Treaty Organization as the realistic approach to a power balance that would give the West a chance to hold up its end in the Cold War.

The President was keenly urgent. "Mankind must put an end to war," he declared, "or war will put an end to mankind." World law in the present situation must come, he said, from the United Nations which is "the only body where all nations, regardless of power, are equal and sovereign."

The way to security and peace, the President affirmed, lies through disarmament. "For fifteen years this organization has sought the reduction and destruction of arms. . . . The risks inherent in disarmament pale in comparison to the risks inherent in an unlimited arms race." "We in the United States have labored this year . . . to find an approach to disarmament which would be so far-reaching, yet realistic, so mutually balanced and beneficial, that it could be accepted by every nation, and it is in this spirit that we have presented" a program of general and complete disarmament.

But this disarmament program is not enough, President Kennedy insisted. "We must create even as we destroy, creating world-wide law and law enforcement as we outlaw world-wide war and weapons." The President concluded: "Never have the nations of the world had so much to lose or so much to gain. Together we shall save our planet or together we shall perish in its flames."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senator Fulbright was realistic, with his feet on the hard ground of tried and true nineteenth-century balance-of-power politics. It would be futile, he declared, to attempt a revision of the UN charter. "The problem is not basically a legal matter but one of power politics in a divided world. . . . We would be far better advised to seek feasible means of building a cohesive community of free nations. This objective should be pursued as far as possible within the United Nations. In large measure, however, it must be pressed outside of the UN through instrumentalities that reflect a limited but real community of common interests." "Proposals for a 'new world order,' through radical overhaul of the United Nations or through some sort of world federation are utterly fatuous. . . . The failures of the UN and of other international organs suggest that we have already gone beyond what was internationally feasible."

"The need for a new 'concert of nations' is very clear," the Senator argued. "It derives from the formidable threat of aggressive imperialistic Communism." Though the United Nations stands as a "symbol of our aspirations, we can hope at the most, as things stand, to build a viable community of the free world." NATO is an essential instrument of collective security precisely because of the failure of the UN. It is not a realization of the charter but a substitute for it.

Senator Fulbright stated his disillusionment in one pithy sentence: "The history of the UN has been in large measure a history of retreat from false hopes, and of adjustment to the reality of a divided world." His hope lies in a "fragile," "functional rather than federal," "piecemeal and pragmatic" concert of free nations consisting of "an inner community of the North Atlantic nations and an outer community embracing much or all of the non-Communist world."

These two utterances represent the scattered fragments of United States liberalism and the far-stretching sand dunes of United States conservatism. In his United Nations approach, the President spoke for nineteenth-century British-American liberalism, clothed in the language of the mid-twentieth-century's tense urgency. The Senator personified the pessimistic, superficial, apathetic, hand-to-mouth conservatism which is asphyxiating the American people.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These two statements, one rousingly liberal, the other tepidly conservative, do not tell the whole story. They come from two antagonistic groupings in a government representing only the Center and Right of United States public opinion. The extreme Right and the Left are both unrepresented. The generals, who are the logical spokesmen for the extreme Right, have been muzzled temporarily by the administration and left to plot and plan in secret for the *coup d'etat* which they hope to lead in an effort to save the country from "dangerous Reds" like Kennedy and Fulbright.

The United States Left, momentarily disintegrated, with neither organization nor recognized leadership, is stirring uneasily. Its voice is unheard because it lacks spokesmen at the state and national levels. Like the extreme Right, the United States Left is gathering the strength to demand its empty chair on the political platform.

Crisis in United States Economy

No amount of political palaver can cover up the stern realities of a partially paralyzed United States economy. There has been much talk in business and financial circles of the recovery that was to animate the economy during the fourth quarter of 1961. The *Wall Street Journal's* poll of manufacturers, published on September 29, 1961, was headlined: "Recovery Disappointing." The first paragraph of the report read: "Disappointed by the pace of economic recovery, most manufacturers plan no significant step-up in hiring during the final three months of 1961."

Kennedy's economists have emptied their bag of tricks—easier money, higher social security payments, speed-up in highway construction, larger "defense" appropriations. Yet the economy lags. One measure remains untried: a hot but limited war.

Two sets of forces are at work in every economy, the expansive and the contractive. So long as the expansive forces dominate, the economy booms. When the contractive forces are in the ascendant, the economy stagnates. United States economy is stagnating because the contractive forces now have the upper hand.

Until the early years of the present century expansive forces

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

predominated in United States economy. During the past four or five decades the balance has been shifting away from expansion toward contraction. At the time of World War I the contractive forces were strongly in evidence. By the end of the 1920's they had become sufficiently dominant to produce a decade of economic stagnation. It is this shift from expansion toward contraction which permits us to use the word "crisis" to describe recent trends in United States economy. Five bodies of fact support this usage: (1) the perilous rise in fixed charges or "overhead costs"; (2) the persistence of deficit spending and the increase of debt; (3) recklessly increased spending for military (that is, for destructive) purposes; (4) the growth of parasitism in the economy; and (5) stagnation as the outstanding feature of the economy.

Government expenditures for goods and services were $8.5 billion in 1929, $25 billion in 1941, $39 billion in 1950, and $100 billion in 1960. During these three decades, the output of the economy was multiplied by 5. Government spending was multiplied by 12. Government spending increased more than twice as fast as the increase in production. Currently the United States economy is carrying a tax burden of around one-fifth of the Gross National Product. This is an overhead cost that must be met in good times and bad times alike.

Sharp increases have taken place in the volume of deficit spending and debt, with a consequent rise in interest payments, which are a second major overhead cost. Deficit spending is standard practice in wartime. The war years showed heavy deficits. Peacetime deficit spending got under way during the Great Depression. For the fiscal years beginning with 1931, every year showed expenditure in excess of receipts up to 1947 when there was a small excess of receipts. From 1948 to 1960 four years showed surpluses, nine years showed deficits. United States debt has increased rapidly during the past three decades. Public net debt in 1930 stood at $31 billion; private net debt was $160 billion, making a total of $191 billion. Thirty years later public net debt had multiplied by ten to $301 billion; private net debt had multiplied by nearly four to $582 billion, making a total net debt of $883 billion.

Military science and technology aim to inflict the maximum

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of damage upon the enemy. The net result of military operations is destructive rather than productive. Assuming that military destructiveness varies directly with spending for military purposes, the United States economy is working overtime to build up an agency whose destructive potential has been increased in recent years from $1.3 billions of military spending in 1929 to $13.8 billion in 1941, $19.3 billion in 1950, and $45.5 billion in 1960. Thus, military spending (potential destructivity) has been multiplied by 35 during the past three decades during which productivity has been multiplied by 5.

Fundamentally, the United States economy has been turning away from primary production such as fishing, agriculture, mining, and lumbering, to secondary production such as fabrication and other forms of processing, to tertiary economic operations: transportation, financing, merchandizing. At the same time the economy is spending heavily for accounting and cost keeping, competitive advertising, and high-power selling.

Increases in the volume of debt and in the payment of rent, interest, and other forms of unearned income have made it possible for an important part of the United States public to consume without working the products turned out by "the workers." Since unearned income enables one part of a community to live, without labor, on the productivity of another part, it is the economic foundation of all parasitism. Parasitism strengthens the contractive forces of any economy.

A Stagnating Economy

Growing overhead costs, increasing deficit spending and debt, mushrooming militarism and parasitism all lead away from economic expansion toward contraction and stagnation. Economic stagnation is a term that may be applied to an enterprise that is static, neither expanding nor contracting.

A statistical review of the past decade shows industrial production moving ahead irregularly for five years, from an index number of 113 in 1950 to 146 in 1955. During the next five year period the record shows stagnation with a drop in 1958 to 141, a slight increase in 1959, and in 1960 another rise to 164.

Particular industries show similar trends. Steel increased from a production of 97 million tons in 1950 to 117 million in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1955, with a drop to 85 million in 1958, and a rise to 99 in 1960. Auto producers, the largest manufacturing industry, sold 6.7 million passenger cars in 1950, 7.9 million in 1955, 4.3 million in 1958, 5.6 million in 1959, and 6.7 million in 1960. As the *New York Times* observed editorially on August 17, 1961, these facts show stagnation in the economy.

Some of the long-established United States industries are in far worse plight. Agriculture requires a federal subsidy of about 6 billions annually to balance its books. Mining and shipbuilding are distressed segments of the economy. The railways are practically bankrupt. Current factual evidence points unmistakeably to stagnation as the outstanding aspect of the American economy.

If our assumptions about the growth of overhead costs in direct ratio to the size, extent, and complexity of an economy are valid, the United States, operating on a planet-wide basis, with a per capita income almost twice as large as its nearest competitor, could be expected to have a correspondingly lower growth rate than smaller more concentrated economies. Indeed, this is the case. In terms of recent economic growth, West Germany heads the list, with Britain in the middle, and the United States at the bottom.

Except for periods of hot war, the United States economy suffers acutely from excess capacity. Large areas of the economy such as shipbuilding, soft coal mining, steel production, and auto production have operated at less than capacity, even in prosperous years, since war's end in 1945. This involves only partial use of the plant and a constant volume of unemployment. Particularly in some of the older industries, where glut has had time to establish and institutionalize itself, stagnation has become chronic.

These five bodies of fact support the contention that the United States economy has passed out of an era of vigorous growth and expansion and entered a period of contraction and stagnation.

Weapons are an important factor in war, but not the decisive one; it is man and not material that counts.

—*Mao Tse-Tung*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Free Press? Free Country? Free World?

Three weeks before *FREEDOM: PROMISE AND MENACE* was published we sent review copies to more than thirty papers and magazines, including the *Christian Science Monitor*. The *Monitor* carries a literary section, weekly, in two editions. On September 23 we mailed them the following copy, requesting display ads in both editions.

— JUST PUBLISHED —

FREEDOM: PROMISE & MENACE

by SCOTT NEARING

A Critique of the Cult of Freedom

A book which challenges the basic theorical assumptions of the American Way of Life

Clothbound 208 pages $3.50

Social Science Institute, Harborside, Maine

On September 28 we received an answer from the *Monitor's* New York office: "In regard to placing advertising for your book *FREEDOM: PROMISE AND MENACE* in our columns: we very much appreciate your consideration of our newspaper and it is therefore with regret that we shall not be able to accept this advertising. It has been our policy for a number of years never to give reasons for declining advertising. Please do understand these matters are given most thoughtful consideration and are intended to be of mutual benefit."

We would like to know why an "International Daily Newspaper" (as the *Monitor* styles itself) refuses to print a paid advertisement of a scholarly book dealing with one of the most important theoretical and practical questions facing the American people.

WOULD YOU ALSO LIKE TO KNOW? READ THE BOOK.

Social Science Institute, Harborside, Maine

(Advertisement)

SPAIN TODAY

Monthly Newsletter published by

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC SPAIN

Waldo Frank, Chairman
Freda Kirchwey, Otto Nathan, Vice Chairmen
Mario De Salegui, Secretary

Uncensored facts from inside Spain

Address Secretary
Box 159 Cathedral Station
New York 25

(Advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANOTHER FRED COOK "SPECIAL"

For October 28, *The Nation* announces another of its special features by Fred J. Cook, prize winning author of "The FBI," "The CIA," and other exposés which have made magazine history in the last several years. The title is "JUGGERNAUT: the Warfare State," and its subject is the rise to dominance in the United States of that "military-industrial complex" against which President Eisenhower uttered so solemn a warning in his Farewell Address.

Thoughtful people will recognize at once the immense scope of the subject and its crucial importance to the times in which we live. For what is at stake is not only the American democratic tradition, but also—as Mr. Cook shows in his characteristically dramatic, thoroughly documented fashion—the broader issue of war or peace in an age in which war could mean the annihilation of civilization.

Like most of its predecessors, this special feature will take up an entire 64-page issue of *The Nation*. And, judging by its predecessors, it will be difficult to obtain on newsstands after the first few days of publication. "The CIA" not only sold out two out-size editions, but made a best-seller of the *Congressional Record* of August 8, this year, in which it had been reprinted and which sold out within three weeks.

We urge you, therefore, to order your copy of "JUGGERNAUT: the Warfare State," through the coupon below. Or you can get your copy FREE by ordering a six-month trial subscription to *The Nation*.

The Nation 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y. MR

Please send me ( ) copies of "JUGGERNAUT: the Warfare State," at 50¢ per copy, for which I enclose .....

( ) Please send me FREE a copy of "JUGGERNAUT: the Warfare State," plus a six-month subscription to *The Nation*, for which I enclose $4.

Name ..... Address .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

(Advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS BOOKS

	List Price	Price with Sub
AMERICAN RADICALS edited by Harvey Goldberg, paper	$1.25	$ 6.00
AMERICAN LABOR IN MIDPASSAGE Bert Cochran, Ed., paper	1.25	6.00
MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS by Leo Huberman, paper	1.75	6.00
CUBA—ANATOMY OF A REVOLUTION by Huberman and Sweezy paper cloth	1.75 3.50	6.00 7.00
GUERRILLA WARFARE by Che Guevara	3.50	7.00
CROSSING THE LINE by Claud Cockburn	3.50	7.00
AN ESSAY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PLANNING by Maurice Dobb	3.50	7.00
THE JAZZ SCENE by Francis Newton	4.00	8.00
THE ALIENATION OF MODERN MAN by Fritz Pappenheim	4.00	8.00
CONVICTION edited by Norman MacKenzie	4.00	8.00
THE WALL BETWEEN by Anne Braden	5.00	8.00
THE PRESENT AS HISTORY by Paul M. Sweezy	5.00	8.00
THE CHINESE ECONOMY by Solomon Adler	5.00	8.00
THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF GROWTH by Paul A. Baran	5.00	8.00
NORTH FROM MEXICO by Carey McWilliams	5.00	8.00
THE THEORY OF CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT by Paul M. Sweezy	6.00	9.00
THE GREAT ROAD by Agnes Smedley	6.75	10.00
CASTE, CLASS & RACE by Oliver C. Cox	7.50	10.00

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, JULY 2, 1946 AND JUNE 11, 1960 (74 STAT. 208) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF

Monthly Review published monthly except July and August, when bi-monthly at New York, N. Y. for October 1, 1961.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher: Monthly Review, Inc., 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y.; Editor: Leo Huberman & Paul M. Sweezy, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y.; Managing editor: Leo Huberman & Paul M. Sweezy, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y.; Business manager: Leo Huberman, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y.

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.)

Monthly Review, Inc., 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y.

Leo Huberman, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y.

Paul M. Sweezy, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y.

Sybil H. May, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: 7641.

Leo Huberman, co-editor.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 28th day of September, 1961. Joseph Strining, Notary Public, State of New York. No. 41-3878725. Qualified in Queens County. Term Expires March 30, 1963.

HAVE *YOU*
JOINED THE
ASSOCIATES YET?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside back cover*)

Avenue, New York City, is not the person of the same name who signed "A Declaration of Conscience on Cuba" which appeared in the September issue of MR.

A letter from the Tokyo publishers of the Japanese translation of Fritz Pappenheim's MR Press book *The Alienation of Modern Man* (now a paperback here at $1.25) informs us that as of September the edition had been through four printings. "When the remaining stock is sold out, the total sales will be 43,000. Very soon, I expect that the fifth printing will be needed." If only Americans would read like Japanese, MR and MR Press would be Big Business!

Excerpts from recent letters:

"I cannot afford to subscribe to MR. I am living on social security retirement. But still less can I afford to be without it. In a world filled with raving lunatics, if I do not hear from some one who is sane, occasionally, I too will go crazy. So I am renewing my subscription with thanks for the good work you are doing."

"I am so happy to have found a socialist magazine that prints sensible, logical, and timely articles. I will always remain a faithful subscriber as long as I can earn enough at the bench to pay for my subscription."

"May I express my great admiration for the honesty and persistence shown by the editors over the long years since the lights began to go out over North America."

"There is no reading more rewarding to me, as a South African student, than your magazine and the books you publish. Your combination of warm humanitarianism and clear analysis are a great boost to those of us who are glad that everything from the U.S. isn't reactionary, and that there are enemies of imperialism even within the leading imperialist nation. We in South Africa are especially inspired by your articles on Cuba, which are the best material available. Congratulations on your good work and keep it up!"

Prime Minister Cheddi Jagan of British Guiana told us recently that the note in MR several years ago requesting readers to send books to Freedom House, 41 Robb St., Lacytown, Georgetown, British Guiana, brought so large a response that the foundation of a fairly good library was established for his People's Party. More books will make it a better library. Accordingly MR is sending another batch of books, pamphlets, and magazines. We urge you to do likewise.

MONTHLY REVIEW ASSOCIATES
invites you to hear
PROF. PAUL A. BARAN
on
THE SOVIET PARTY CONGRESS
Date: Tuesday, December 5, 8:30 P.M. sharp
Place: Palm Gardens, 306 W. 52 Street, New York
Admission: $1 in advance . . $1.50 at the door . . Associates, free
Send your order for tickets, with payment enclosed, to
Monthly Review Associates, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

we can think of is to appeal to you, our subscribers, to get the word around. Tell your friends; urge them to subscribe and to tell their friends; send a sub to your local library, school, church, minister, rabbi, Congressman, newspaper. And do it now when you get free books with new subscriptions, books which you can either add to your own library or use as Christmas gifts. We are now offering the clothbound first edition of the *Cuba* book, or John Gill's *Tide Without Turning,* a $4.50 clothbound book which tells the dramatic story of Elijah Lovejoy and his fight for freedom of the press in pre-Civil War America. For details of our Xmas specials see page 313.

In the October issue of *Harper's,* Richard Chase, Professor of English at Columbia, reviews "The New Campus Magazines" and finds that in most of them "the emphasis is on the left." "Campus radicals" he calls the editors and contributors, and in one passage remarks: "*Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution,* a frankly pro-Castro work by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy, they take as gospel or at any rate presumptive truth." We are highly flattered but could wish that the gospel were somewhat more widely disseminated on the campuses; also that more of the campus radicals were readers of MR. May we suggest that now is the time to send the magazine or the book or both to a college student you know. And faculty members can help by making sure that your library subscribes to MR and displays it on the open periodical shelves. (We have found that in most colleges, any such request by a faculty member is automatically complied with.)

By the time this issue reaches you, we hope that Harvey O'Connor's new book entitled *Crisis in World Oil* will be ready for the printer. A sequel to *The Empire of Oil,* published by MR Press in 1955, the new book is now scheduled for spring publication. Since *Empire* has long been out of print, we plan to republish it at the same time, and to box the two volumes in a handsome gift package. Watch for prepublication offers in forthcoming issues.

We have had many requests to reprint our pamphlet *Socialism Is the Only Answer,* published in 1951 and long since out of print; and we have decided to do so, since it still serves as a useful ABC guide to newcomers to the movement who need to know what socialism is all about. Socialism *is* the only answer, and we must never tire of saying so. The reprint will sell for 35¢ a copy, 3 for $1, and 20 for $5. Orders can be sent in immediately.

Let us again call attention to our temporary offer of J. P. Morray's *From Yalta to Disarmament* at a price of $5, a saving of $3.50 from the list price. Seldom have we had so much praise for an MR Press book (the other day, much to our surprise, a Wall Street lawyer acquaintance went out of his way to thank us for what he considered to be a most useful collection of documentary material and an able argument for an important point of view). Morray's book is indispensable for understanding what is happening at the UN right now. After December 31, the price goes back to $8.50. Order now.

MR Associates is pleased to announce a meeting to be held in New York on December 5th at which Professor Paul A. Baran, who needs no introduction to MR readers, will discuss the Twenty-second Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, including the new Party Program and the rift in the world Communist movement which came into the open in the quarrel over Albania. For details, see the box below.

We have been asked to announce that Naomi Levine of 541 West End

(*continued on page* 336)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOVIET REVIEW provides you with up-to-date translations in key areas of social analysis and criticism, literature and the arts, and science and technology. It presents a broad spectrum of Soviet life and thought.

REPRESENTATIVE ARTICLES are selected from over fifty Soviet journals and newspapers. Each article is a Soviet writer's analysis of one subject — family relations, modern jazz, the reorganization of Soviet science, or new legislation in the treatment of crime.

THERE ARE NO EDITORIALS — only full, accurate translations permitting free, unhampered insight into behind-the-headlines trends and thinking.

CONTENTS FOR NOVEMBER include: Confessions of a Generation: Youth Opinion Poll (Komsomolskaya Pravda); Employment Transfers, D. Bazarbayev (State and Law — Gosudarstvo i Pravo); Public Participation in Settling Labor Disputes, Evgeny Klyenov (Gosudarstvo i Pravo); The Role of the Physician in Promoting Scientific Atheism (Problems of Philosophy — Voprosy Filosofi); Clinical Death Defeated, P. Sevalnyova (Science and Life—Nauka i Zhizn); Too Much Work in the Boarding Schools! B. Shirvindt (Izvestia).

3 PREVIOUS ISSUES FREE to new annual subscribers, if prepaid.

A popularly priced magazine bringing you first-hand knowledge of Soviet life and thought

FILL OUT THIS ORDER FORM AND MAIL TODAY

INTERNATIONAL ARTS AND SCIENCES PRESS
156 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 10, N. Y.

Please enter a subscription to *The Soviet Review* as checked below:

☐ one year at $6.00 (plus 3 free issues, if prepaid).
☐ six months at $3.00
☐ check enclosed ☐ please bill me

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE MR

(Advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED